

BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
(916) 653-8007
(916) 653-0989 FAX
Website: www.bof.fire.ca.gov



MINUTES BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION FULL BOARD OF FORESTRY MEETING

Lake Tahoe, CA

May 4, 2006

BOARD OF FORESTRY MEMBERS PRESENT:

Stan Dixon, Chairman
Kirk Marckwald, Vice Chair
David Nawi
Pam Giacomini
Jim Ostrowski
Bruce Saito
Ron Nehring
Mark Bosetti
Gary Rynearson

BOARD STAFF:

George Gentry, Executive Officer
Eric Huff, Executive Officer, Forester's Licensing
Chris Zimny, Regulations Coordinator
Laura Estrada, Staff Services Analyst
Carol Horn, Executive Assistant

DEPARTMENTAL STAFF:

Bill Snyder, Deputy Director for Resource Management
Duane Shintaku, Assistant Deputy Director, Forest Practice
Dennis Hall, Staff Chief, Forest Practice
Giny Chandler, Department Counsel, Forestry and Fire Protection
Wayne Mitchell, Asst. Deputy Director, Fire Protection

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dixon called the May 4, 2006 meeting of the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection to order.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Dixon asked for Board approval of the April minutes. Because some Board members did not have a chance to review the minutes, they were deferred to the June meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR

There was nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Dixon introduced Rod McGinnes, Regional Administration for National Marine Service. Mr. McGinnes was meeting with the Fish and Game Commission. Mr. McGinnes introduced himself to the Board members. Ms. Charlotte Ambrose usually represents the National Marine Service. Mr. McGinnes encourages the Board to move forward in reviewing the needs of salmonics and how CDF's forest practice rules meet those needs. Mr. McGinnes also encourages operating under the T and I Rules for threatened and impaired streams rules that cover harvesting. Mr. McGinnes looks forward to working with the Board.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Mr. Bill Snyder, Deputy Director for Resource Management, did not give a report. Mr. Snyder indicated what he would say today would be the same report he gave at the joint meeting on Tuesday.

REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA OAK MORTALITY TASK FORCE (COMTF)

Mr. Mark Stanley, representing the Oak Mortality Task Force (COMTF) gave a brief history of the California Oak Mortality Task Force. Mr. Stanley distributed a handout to Board Members and give a powerpoint presentation. The presentation included history and status of the Sudden Oak Disease. Dying Tanoaks and Coast Live Oaks first noticed in abundance in Marin County in 1995, caused was unknown. UC Extension, CDF Pest Program, USDA Forest Service entomologists and pathologists, researchers and arborists were working on finding the cause. In July 2000, the pathogen was identified. In August 2000, the Task Force was formed at the direction of BOF with CFPC. Seven counties were known to have positive infections, 6 hosts. CDF commits \$100K. Regulators got involved. By 2003, ten counties and numerous species were involved. Redwood and Douglas-fir were declared hosts. The first SOD Symposium was held in January 2003. In March of 2004, a nursery in Azusa found to be infected, potentially shipped infected stock to 40 states. APHIS enacted emergency regulations on nursery operations and changes confirmation process.

Current State Disease: 14 California counties, one in Oregon, 100 hosts and associated hosts. USC shows that there are three genotypes in California, indicating the introduction was not natural. The pathogen is most active in the Big Sur area and Western Sonoma County. In 2004, there were 176 nursery-associated positive sites, and 99 positive sites in 2005.

New Research Findings – In the lab, Rhododendrons have been infected from pathogen in the soil. The pathogen appears to be moved by humans. Several new species of *Phytophthoras* have been found as a result of research on *Pr*. Water monitoring was performed in 70 locations.

Aerial survey with ground follow-up has been effective in identifying new infection area, but long after the infection has occurred. There is an endless need for training for various user groups and interest groups. Because the science is still developing, there is a constant need for revision of regulations and BMPs. Watershed level water monitoring seems to be one way for early detection. Funding for Task Force staff will be a challenge. For the most up-to-date information: www.usddenoakdeath.org.

Member Marckwald asked if legislators have taken a particular interest in the magnitude of funding needed.

Mr. Stanley said there was currently no state funding.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

CALIFORNIA FOREST PEST COUNCIL

No report was made.

RANGE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RMAC)

The next meeting of the Range management Advisory Committee will be May 16 and 17 in Sacramento. The major topics of the meeting will be a discussion of the Board's policy statement and review of the State Water Board's response to the Board's letter regarding voluntary programs for water quality.

MONITORING STUDY GROUP (MSG)

The next meeting of the MSG is May 23, at which the MSG strategic plan will be reviewed. The interagency mitigation monitoring program will meet May 17 and 18 to conduct training at JDSF. An MSG report was included in the Board Binder.

PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS EXAMINING COMMITTEE (PFEC)

The next meeting of the PFEC will be May 11 in Sacramento at the Twin Tower Auditorium.

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

There was no report.

REPORT/UPDATE ON THE STATE PETITION PROCESS FOR UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS

Executive Officer Gentry said pursuant to the Board's motion, he and Ms. Chandler drafted a letter to the Forest Service requesting assistance and financial support for the process. They have not heard back. Executive Officer Gentry is working on locations for workshops.

REPORT BY TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ON THE PATHWAY FORUM

Mr. Carl Hastey, Deputy Director for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, said his agency was formed by two states and was blessed by the federal government. TRPA is responsible for establishing environmental carrying capacity thresholds for Lake Tahoe. Those values are the basis for the regional plan efforts. The thresholds were first created in 1982. TRPA is creating a new land use plan for environmental improvement for Lake Tahoe. Their focus will be forest fuels in the basin. The risk assessment has been completed for the seven districts. TRPA is looking at operating models. There is \$123 million dollars worth of work, \$3,100 per acre. Seventy percent of the homeownership do not live in Tahoe.

REPORT BY THE CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Mr. Peter Maholland, Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Program Coordinator for the California Tahoe Conservancy, reported on the Conservancy. They are a state agency within the Resources, established in 1985 by the Lake Tahoe Bond Act. Initial acquisition is their focus. Their jurisdiction is the California side of the Lake Tahoe basin. The California Tahoe Conservancy has no regulatory authority. The California Tahoe Conservancy's mission is to preserve, protect, restore, enhance and sustain the unique and significant natural resources and recreational opportunities of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Board of Directors consist of the Secretary for Resources, Director of the Department of Finance, Assembly Appointee, Senate Rules Committee Appointee, El Dorado County, Placer County, City of South Lake Tahoe, and the U. S. Forest Service (ex-officio, non-voting). The Conservancy's funding is \$25 million annually. Some of their challenges are soil erosion and water quality, fire and fuels, lack of

public access, and fragmented ecosystems. Project Objectives are (1) reduce large continuous brush fields and reduce overall fuel loading; (2) protect, enhance, and restore naturally functioning habitat; (3) prepare the site for future fire reintroduction through prescribed burning; and (4) work collaboratively with regulatory agencies to develop a forest management project using mechanized equipment in an environmentally sensitive manner.

UPDATE ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR) FOR JACKSON DEMONSTRATION STATE FOREST (JDSF) DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

May 22 was the date selected for the field trip to JDSF. A notice will go out next week. Executive Officer Gentry is working on the logistics and areas to be visited. If Board members have a specific request for items they would like to visit, please let the Executive Officer know. The Executive Officer asked Mr. Henly to put together the comments in a suitable format for distribution to the Board members, so they may review the public comments received. A workshop session will be scheduled, between Memorial Day and the end of June, for the Board to start making some consideration in regard to JDSF.

Member Nawi asked if CDF had begun preparing responses.

Executive Officer Gentry said CDF had begun preparing technical responses, nothing that would relate to policy or direction.

Member Nawi asked if there would be a meeting with CDF staff, Member Rynearson and himself to provide the direction.

Executive Officer Gentry said some responses will require a decision of the full board.

Member Rynearson said it is phrased as a “workshop” but potentially there is an action item where they will direct the contractor by staff to develop the final EIR based on the Board’s recommendation, and then hold the subsequent hearing and then adopt the final EIR and certify it at a subsequent hearing. When Member Rynearson says CDF, he means the contractor. There are two CDFs that the Board will seek input from; one is the contractor CDF who developed the document, and the other is from CDF Management.

Member Nawi felt the Committee should only meet with the Contractor-CDF.

Member Rynearson said through the workshop process will move from an administrative draft EIR, then finalize the draft EIR for consideration before the Board and certification, then the Board makes recommendations to the Department to make changes in the forest management plan, at a subsequent meeting, the Board will adopt the forest management plan for Jackson. That would end the Board’s process, and the Department could go about managing the forest based on that plan.

Member Nawi agreed with Member Rynearson, but said it was possible to finish the EIR in one step. The Board could certify the EIR, saying they like the plan with the following provisions.

Mr. Bill Synder said CDF is in the process of preparing responses to technical elements. CDF Staff will meet with the Committee to discuss responses.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bill Keye, representing California Licensed Forester’s Association, suggested a tour of diversity settings be arranged at the JDSF field trip to see redwood silviculture.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD

REPORT OF THE SENSITIVE WATERSHEDS NOMINATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE (SWNRC)

Mr. George Gentry reported on the Sensitive Watershed meeting. Executive Officer Gentry went over the second part on goals and objectives.

FOREST PRACTICE COMMITTEE (FPC)

Chairman Nawi said the Tahoe Exemption arose with the intent of allowing TRPA, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, CDF, and the Board of Forestry to have consistent, streamlined regulatory provisions in effect for fuel hazard reduction in the Tahoe Basin. The meeting got off to a good start, then ran into substantial diversion of the ways. At last month's Committee, Members Nawi and Ostrowski thought it would be a good idea to try one more meeting with TRPA. That meeting was held Monday in South Lake Tahoe with TRPA, the Regional Board, the Tahoe Conservancy, CDF Unit staff, Board staff and Mr. Nawi and Mr. Ostrowski. It appears that the Regional Board would be satisfied, pending further review, to rely on the substantive provisions of the TRPA Regulations, which apply throughout the basin for water quality protection. The Regional Board will hold a review of TRPA Regulations. CDF and Board staff will be reviewing Board's Regulations that are proposed to ensure that they are consistent with TRPA Regulations. The Regional Board would rely on TRPA Regulations, and the regulations before the board could go forward independently. We would be looking at a 3-way MOU which would address joint permitting and enforcement. A joint BCP was suggested to get funding for additional resources to enforce regulations in the Tahoe Basin; and to rely on local fire departments in the basin through MOUs with TRPA they are enforcing. A conference call meeting has been scheduled for June 1. The Committee hopes to have a draft MOU later this month. The Committee will consider the regulations at next month's meeting, and bring to the Board for a 15- or 45-day notice.

Mr. Martin Goldberg, representing Lake Valley Fire, made a presentation on the Tahoe Handbook for Fuel Hazard Reduction Best Management Practices. Mr. Goldberg is looking forward to creating a handbook that would incorporate best management practices and fuel hazard reduction processes in the Tahoe Basin that would best address water quality considerations. The Committee supports Mr. Goldberg's endeavor.

On April 24, the Committee held a workshop in Sacramento to discuss the process, not the substance, and timing for a review of the literature concerning protection of anadromous salmonids and domestic water uses, and the issues raised with the existing T and I Rules. Much progress was made at the meeting last month in Sacramento. Chairman Nawi is pleased at the cooperative way the issues have been addressed. There is a common goal of having a sound, open, and timely process for the review of the scientific issues presented. The process would be overseen by a group designated by the Board, probably Resources Agency people. The Committee is considering having an independent contractor, they are interested in using Tetra-Tech, if possible. The Committee is asking for submissions of literature relevant to issues for a period of 45 days. If the Committee is able to obtain a third party contractor, they would conduct the literature review. The format for the literature review would be determined by the process the Committee is working on, and administered by the Oversight Committee. The scientific people would present the literature review to the Board and public in an open debate, and then the issues would be open to consideration and action by the Forest Practice Committee and the Board for a decision. The Committee will make sure they have the right topics identified and the proper format. The Committee would like to hold another meeting between now and the next Board Meeting in June. The meeting will be held in Sacramento. Based on the progress the Committee has made, there is consensus on the Committee that the Board can post for public hearing (1) an extension of the T and I Rules that presently exist without change; and (2) the Regulatory Streamline Proposal, which has been agreed to in Committee for at least 2 months, but they could not go ahead with it because they did not know the sunset date as those rules are attached to the T and I Rules. Without knowledge of the sunset

date on the T and I Rules, the Committee had to hold up the Regulatory Streamline Proposal. In terms of extending the existing T and I Rules, there is a difference of opinion on the Committee. The Committee does now know if the literature review can be carried out by Tetra-Tech, and if so, how long it will take. Tetra-Tech is funded by EPA, and they are under an existing contract, so all it would take is a scope-of-work. The Committee had considerable discussion regarding the appropriate time for the extension. Some members felt the extension should be for one year, and if necessary, extend the regulations by one year. Chairman Nawi believes it is possible to complete in one year, but given the complexity, it would be optimistic. The Board has to decide how to notice the regulations. One option discussed by the Committee yesterday was to notice and extension of the T and I Rules with alternate extension periods of one, two, and three years. By the time the rules come to the Board for consideration, the appropriate extension period could be decided by the Board. The CLFA Streamlining Regulatory Proposal Notice was identical one-, two-, and three-year extension.

Member Ostrowski said Chairman Nawi made a very good summary of the issues.

Member Bosetti said much progress has been made since the March Board meeting in identifying a process. There are a couple of things the Committee still grapples with which concern Member Bosetti. Member Bosetti believes the Committee can overcome most of the issues, and get to a point of a focused review of the issues. This package has always had a great deal of controversy attached to it. On one hand you have belief that the interim rules are not effective enough, that we need to have more done, and that the species relying on the measures are not adequately protected. On the other hand, you have a group of people who are regulated by the rules, and they say the rules go too far and it has not been proved that they are necessary. Member Bosetti favors a one-year extension. Member Bosetti is concerned about having two separate packages move forward at the same time. It places extra burden on staff. At the close of yesterday's meeting, Mr. Bosetti thought there would be two separate packages; one package with CLFA's changes incorporated with the current T and I Rules with a sunset date of one year or with a year optional. The elements of the Streamline Proposal brought forward by CLFA are minor changes but they are key operational issues that help address some of the deficiencies in application of the current T and I Rules.

Member Marckwald believes the proper way to do this is with two packages. He is concerned that the Board will get into overly complex, and cross-connected arguments talking about CLFA changes and the extension. Member Marckwald supports Member Bosetti in the term. Given that there are about 6 or 7 substantive areas, Member Marckwald doesn't believe the Board will get through it in a year. Perhaps, it might be a series of changes rather than all at once. One year is overly optimistic. Member Marckwald believes the right way is to offer option 1, 2, and 3.

Chairman Nawi said the process is being viewed as a template to follow for evaluating other scientific issues. The Board must move as expeditiously as possible. Chairman Nawi agrees with Member Marckwald regarding the length of the extension, if the Board goes out with a notice now, the final decision of the option could be made at the time of the hearing on the regulations. If the Board is ready to notice in July of 07, the Board would notice amendments, and the amendments would supersede the existing rules without any second action being taken. If the Board extends the rules for only one year and it turns out that the process cannot be completed to notice in July then the Board would be faced with extending the rules again, which would be in the midst of the scientific review, and would be a distraction from proceeding with the review. Chairman Nawi supports the one, two, or three year option for both the CLFA Streamlining Proposal and the T and I Rules. Regarding one or two packages, Chairman Nawi has no opinion. The Committee thought it might be clearer having two packages.

Mr. Chris Zimny, Regulations Coordinator, said if the Board notices both packages with the options for the date change, that should be whole enough and visible enough for OAL to see that there is a

consistent change. It is do-able if it is showed that one rule package won't have a three year extension , and the other package has a one year extension.

Member Rynearson felt the Board need clarification from OAL. It is OAL's requirements is to look at regulations to make sure they are consistent, non-duplicative, and don't conflict with other parts of the law. If the Board sends two packages, where one is contingent on approval of the other, Member Rynearson is concerned how OAL would see that.

Member Marckwald thinks action needs to be taken today, premised on staff clarifying with OAL, and if they say no we want one package – it goes as one. The Board should go with whatever OAL wants.

05-06-07: Member Nawi moved that the Board notice the T and I and the Regulatory Streamline Proposal for 45-day notice on both sets of issues with the alternatives of a one, two, and three year extension of the sunset reflected in each, and leave to the staff contingent on their discussions with OAL whether these be noticed as separate packages or as one consolidated package. Member Marckwald seconded the motion.

Chairman Dixon asked for comments from the Committee before asking for public comment.

Member Rynearson was expecting more conversation before moving forward with a motion. This is the fourth time since he has been on the Board that they voted on an extension package. He is supportive of a one year extension. Member Rynearson thinks the Board owes it to the landowner, other agencies, and the public to move forward with a thorough review. He believes a one-year time limit will force the Board to force that. Member Rynearson asked if anyone has talked to Tetra-Tech to see if they are available and can undertake this project.

Member Nawi said the Committee didn't know the answer about Tetra-Tech's availability, which is why there is not a timeline. If Tetra-Tech is not available, the Board will have to look at alternatives.

Member Ostrowski wants to be clear that any action the Board takes that this is not an extension because the Board thinks the rules are good to go. The rules need to be reviewed for protecting anadromous fisheries.

Member Bosetti said the reason for the extension is to maintain protections that are currently in place and provided by the interim rules, but to allow the Board an opportunity to evaluate their necessity and efficiency in the coming year.

As maker of the motion, Member Nawi has no problem with the clarifications from Members Ostrowski and Bosetti. It is clear from the record that the Board is embarking on a very thorough review of the rules and protections they afford during this period of extension.

As seconder of the motion, Member Marckwald agrees.

Chairman Dixon asked Member Ostrowski to clarify his amendment so it can be included in the motion.

Member Ostrowski said his amendment was "the intent of any extension of the T and I Rules would be to allow time for a review and possible restructuring of our rules that are intended to protect anadromous salmonics habitat.

Member Nawi is comfortable with the sentiment. The length of the extension is determined by the factors Member Ostrowski mentioned – a review of the appropriate protection. Member Nawi accepts the amendment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Michele Dias, representing the California Forestry Association, is pleased with Member Nawi's leadership, he has achieved a lot in a short amount of time. Ms. Dias is concerned about the 3 year option. Ms. Dias believes this can be completed in one year. She said the California Forestry Association will be involved in good faith. Ms. Dias urged the Board to not accept the three-year option, she wants the one-year extension.

Mr. Chantz Joyce, representing California Licensed Foresters Association, encouraged the Board to amend the motion and remove the three-year extension.

Mr. Paul Mason, representing the Sierra Club, felt the Committee has made good progress. Mr. Mason believes the likelihood of completing the rest of the process and doing scientific review, and having discussions on how to modify the rules by next July is impossible. The Board should move forward the rule package forward, with multiple options, and find out if Tetra-Tech is available.

Ms. Jodi Frediani – is very pleased with the Committee discussions and Chairman Nawi. Although progress is being made, there is still missing information. Do not attempt to rush package through. Ms. Frediani agrees with Mr. Mason that this cannot be completed in one year. She likes idea of options.

Ms. Charlotte Ambrose, representing National Marine Fisheries, thanked Chairman Nawi for his leadership and also Members Bosetti and Ostrowski. She thinks the group is making great progress. She believes there is an urgency to move forward expeditiously with the understanding that it needs to be done right. Ms. Ambrose encourages the Committee and Board to consider all three options. She believes there will be more information in the next month and half.

Mr. Richard Gienger said the one year option is not realistic. The end result will depend on the adequacy of the Blue Ribbon Panel that deals with the information that is produced.

Member Rynearson is willing to accept a one or two year option, but not three years. Member Rynearson has concerns about sending out two separate packages without knowing how OAL will react. He would prefer one package. Member Rynearson thought there should not vote today, instead get answers from OAL and Tetra-Tech and move forward at the June meeting.

Member Giacomini agrees with Member Rynearson. The Board needs to know if Tetra-Tech can perform the work. Member Giacomini leans toward a one or two year option, one rule package or deferring the vote until the Board gets the information from Tetra-Tech.

Member Nawi hopes when the Board considers the rule for action by the Board, the three year option will fall away. Member Nawi included the three year option because between now and the meeting when it would be considered, which would be around July or August, the Board might find that Tetra-Tech is not available or something else could come up and the Board finds out that it can not be done in one or two years. When the Board considers the regulation for adoption, they will hopefully know what the situation with Tetra-Tech is.

Member Giacomini said the Board can always extend again if we find out that they cannot get the work completed. Member Giacomini feels it is critical for the Board to keep their feet to fire.

Member Marckwald said the motion instructs staff to immediately consult with OAL. Member Marckwald said the best thing is to make sure staff understands the instruction and has the authority to clarify that.

If OAL felt the right way to do this was two packages, the Board would have two packages, if OAL felt one package was right, the Board would prepare one package. Let the staff have the flexibility to do it the way OAL wants.

Member Saito asked if the Board was proposing to modify the amendment to one or two years or do we vote on the motion as is, and then propose another motion.

Chairman Dixon said the Committee did an excellent job. The Chairman didn't see any reason to delay the vote. After the motion has been voted on, another motion could be made. Chairman Dixon would not support three years. One year is optimistic, and Chairman Dixon supports the two year extension, although he would be happy to have the process completed in one year. Chairman Dixon supports the motion as drafted. There are 45 days before the public hearing process, during which most questions could be answered by that time.

Chairman Dixon called for a roll call vote.

ACTION ITEM - In response to Forest Practice Committee Agenda Item #1

Nehring	Aye
Bosetti	Aye
Marckwald	Aye
Rynearson	No
Nawi	Aye
Giacomini	No
Ostrowski	Aye
Saito	Aye
Dixon	Aye

The motion was carried with 7-2 votes, with two nos.

Member Nawi expressed his appreciation for those interested. Ms. Charlotte Ambrose has made her staff available to help with the literature review. Member Nawi thanked Mr. Tom Splitter, Mr. Galen Lee and Mr. Marty Berbach who have been available and participated, CDF staff Dennis Hall and Duane Shintaku. CFA has been very prompt in providing material from CH2M Hill. This continued positive level of participation will make the project a success.

Member Ostrowski is committed to having this package completed by July of next year.

POLICY COMMITTEE

Member Nawi said the Policy Committee discussed the status of the draft Board Policy Statement. The Executive Officer has received some comments, which will be incorporated at next month's meeting of the Policy Committee.

The Committee also discussed the Joint Policy Statement on Anadromous Species. The Committee went through the document and identified a number of questions. The Committee would like Board and CDF staff to meet with Gail Newton to answer questions and provide clarity. It will take scrutiny to make this document what the Committee wants it to be.

Member Ostrowski requested the Department polish the joint policy before returning it to Committee.

Member Marckwald said the Committee received a letter from CLFA suggesting some areas for legislation next year. The Policy Committee will discuss the CLFA letter at their next meeting. The Policy Committee will work the Executive Officer noting a new grant to Fish and Wildlife. Conservation easements potential will be a useful tool up the road.

Member Rynearson said the Policy Committee might want to discuss coordination of presentation of conservation easements and sustained yield plans at their next meeting.

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Member Rynearson said the Committee discussed the process of the Road Management Plan regulation. The Committee now has a publicly-released draft which was developed working with staff and Board and Staff Counsel, which contain the required elements up for a functional equivalency program. The Committee plans to have the draft reviewed for content by Agency. A special Management Committee meeting to review the content of the road management plan has been scheduled for May 24 in Sacramento. Timing is critical, the Committee would like to move forward with a 45-day notice at the June or July meeting. The Chief Counsel for the Resources Agency has been appointed to a district federal court, and Mr. Reeves will be leaving shortly.

The Stewardship Non-Industrial Timber Plan Committee met last week in Santa Rosa. They plan to meet on June 2 to meet with all parties who have been involved and come to an substantial agreement on the draft document, which can then be forwarded to the agencies involved. The SNTMP will be used to help assist developing permitting processes

The Committee had an excellent discussion on PTEIRs. The Committee received a letter from Mendocino Redwood Company's chief forester requesting specific answers to 3 questions on the PTEIR and how it is to be administered. The Committee raised some questions which need to be addressed. The Committee recommended forwarding the three questions to Staff Counsel and to CDF staff for review, consideration, and response. The Committee will have a discussion of the PTEIR at the July meeting.

Member Rynearson said the Committee discussed NTMP maximum sustained productivity document, which was prepared by CDF to provide guidance to preparers of NTMPs. This is agendized for the PFEC for discussion, and the Committee also asked that it be agendized for the next Management Committee. There have been some concerns expressed about the document and its application and how it is to be used. Member Rynearson said the Committee will pass and attach a rule package. The Board will consider the package, and if it is passed it would be forwarded to the Secretary of Resources with a request for consideration to certify it as a functional equivalent.

RESOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE (RPC)

Member Giacommi said the RPC heard a very informative discussion from Mr. Bill Synder on staffing issues. Member Nehring will work with Board staff, CDF staff, and the Union on staffing issues. This is a critical issue that should be discussed before the full board. Member Nehring will make a presentation on staffing issues at the next meeting. Member Nehring has formulated an outline on staffing issues.

A Train-the-Trainer session on 4291 application will be held on May 9th in Redding and June 11 in Santa Rosa.

The RPC discussed the VMP Process/Framework for Policy review and an update on Notice of Preparation for VMP EIR. A Notice of Preparation for the EIR has been prepared, and an Ad hoc Committee has been set up.

SB 841 which increases 4291 clearance up to 300 feet has passed and has been enrolled. There is confusion over language to authorize clearance up to 300 feet. Member Nehring sent a letter to Senator Hollingsworth asking for clarification on the 4291 issue. The use of the term “authorize” is confusing.

The RMAC committee will review a letter from the Water Quality Board, and will meet in Sacramento on May 16.

REPORT OF THE REGULATIONS COORDINATOR

Mr. Chris Zimny, Regulations Coordinator, reported that the RPC Agenda will have two general safety plans introduced from the cities of Goleta and Newport Beach. We are on the clock on this issue. A draft will be available at the June meeting.

An update of the California Fire Plan report was received from consultants. The plan will be updated.

A Regulation Hearing has been scheduled for Los Angeles on Thursday, June 8, and Monday, June 5 in Sacramento for the FPC on T and I.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Mr. George Gentry, Executive Officer for the Board, reported he attended a meeting on April 11 at City Hall in San Francisco on climate summit. The Executive Officer also attended a California Forest Products Commission on April 25 in Sacramento. Today a meeting is being held at Humboldt to discuss if forest resource management can reduce climate change.

PUBLIC FORUM: Members of the public may address the Board on any topic within its jurisdiction not otherwise on the agenda. Submittal of written comments is encouraged to ensure that all comments will be included in the record before the Board. Please be prepared to summarize comments to three minutes in length, or otherwise at the discretion of the Chairman.

Mr. Rich Adams, a Forester I with the California Department of Parks and Recreation Sierra District, read a letter he wrote to the Board on the need for biomass treatment facility in or near the Lake Tahoe Basin. Mr. Adams letter was distributed to Board Members and is attached to minutes.

Mr. Richard Gienger said it was of dire importance to have a balanced blue ribbon committee to deal with T and I. The draft for monitoring will be discussed at the next MSG meeting.

Mr. Bill Key, representing CLFA, thanked Chairman Dixon for his CLFA meeting remarks. The tentative topics for the fall workshop will be legacy roads. CLFA has a new President this year, Adriene Miller. Mr. Chantz Joyce is retiring. The new forest practice committee representative will be Mr. Dave Hammond.

NEW AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

In Member Nawi's work the California Environmental Quality Act, he knows the guidelines. Guidelines contain Appendix G, which focuses on several areas. Staff should work with the Resources Agency in charge of CEQA Guideline to see if this is something to bring back to the Board next month. This could come back with a conceptual proposal to add to the guidelines a checklist and the topic of forest and range lands.

Member Ryneerson said conversion of timberlands have already been addressed in the CEQA process.

There was no unfinished business.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman adjourned the May 4, 2006 meeting of the Board. Member Giacomini, as Acting Chair of the RPC, will reconvene the Scoping Session on the NOP for the VTP.DEIR immediately following adjournment of the Board of Forestry Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

George D. Gentry
Executive Officer

ATTEST:

Stan Dixon
Chairman

Copies of the attendance sheets can be obtained from the Board Office.